

**Glass v. Philadelphia Electric Co.:**

- **Short description:** Mr. Glass worked for the Philadelphia Electric Company (PECO) for 23 years and received only one job evaluation that was less than satisfactory. Throughout his career, Glass was a strong advocate for workers, especially black workers. In 1990, Glass sued for race and age discrimination and for retaliation after having been consistently rejected for promotions and after the company did not post other positions for which he would have been eligible.
- **Procedural setting:** During trial, PECO presented evidence suggesting that Glass had not been promoted to the more desirable positions at least in part because of the negative evaluation he had received. The trial court prevented Glass from presenting evidence to explain that the negative evaluation was due to racial harassment and a hostile work environment.
- **Appellate ruling:** A divided panel reversed the trial court and held that Glass should have been allowed to present his evidence about an allegedly hostile work environment to the jury.
- **Alito's dissent:** Alito dissented, arguing that allowing Glass to tell his side of the story might cause "substantial unfair prejudice." Alito also argued that even if Glass' evidence should have been admitted, the trial judge's abuse of discretion was "harmless."